

## **REMARKS**

In summary, claims 1-3, 5-17, 19-30, and 32-45 are pending. Claims 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 35 § 102. Claims 1-3, 5-17, 19-30, and 32-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 35 § 103. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Claims 1, 15, 29, and 42 are hereby amended. No new matter is added.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 42 and 43 continue to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,822,435 to Boebert *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as “Boebert”). Claim 42 has been amended to more clearly define the method of maintaining security of the secured execution environment. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection, under 35 U.S.C. § 102, of claims 42 and 43 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-17, 19-27, 29, 30, 32-40, 44, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,822,435, in the name of Boebert *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as “Boebert”)

Independent claims have been amended to indicate that both the secured execution environment and second execution environment reside on a single computing device, as shown in Figs. 2 and 5. Additionally claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite that it is the input mode of the secured execution environment upon which the step of directing the flow of user input is based, not by for example, any particular switch set in an allegedly trusted input device. The following discussion focuses on claims 1 and 15.

Boebert does not disclose or suggest Applicant’s claimed invention as amended. For example, Boebert neither discloses nor that it is the secured execution environment state, particularly the secured execution input mode that is used for determining and directing the flow of user input, and that the secured execution environment and second execution environment are both on a single computing device.

This claimed structure is not shown, described or taught in Boebert. Particularly at Col 5 line 66, through Col. 6- 10, the flow of keyboard input is directed not by a state of the secured execution environment, but by a switch, keystroke combination, token or smartcard, to manually activate a trusted mode, in the allegedly trusted input device. No discussion or teaching of the modes or states of the two or more execution environments on a single computing device is identified or described in Boebert.

Further, no control of the trust level of the input device is shown or taught originating in the secure execution environment 67 of the computer in Boebert. The claims teach a trusted input device, not one that can vary its trust level. Applicants submit that the input modes described by the Examiner in the previous office action were actually that of the modes of the allegedly trusted input device. Actually, Boebert was directed and titled to a Trusted Path Subsystem for a workstation, not for solving the problems of secure and trusted input, inputted into a high assurance execution environment where there is also a second execution environment. It is not seen how a trusted device as mandated in the claims of the present invention can be read on the independently configured selectively normal (untrustworthy) or trusted workstation of Boebert.

The Examiner's dissection of the Boebert system and its parts as applied to the present invention do not give a reasonable construction to the claims in light of the specification. The present invention involves security of data flow within the computer depending on the state of the secure execution environment, not on the state regarding the input device that should be trusted in the first place, as in the claims. Examiner's mapping of the Boebert trusted path subsystem 30 having a normal and trusted mode, is not equivalent or a reasonable comparison to the present invention's secured execution environment mode and its new way of directing trusted input inside of a computing device having both secure and second execution environments. The two inventions attempt to solve two different sets of problems.

Claim 29 as amended, includes that trusted user interface engine has a trusted input manager for determining the state of the secured execution environment, not of the input device. No determination of the state of the secured execution environment is found, taught

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-2818/305956.01  
**Application No.:** 10/693,061  
**Office Action Dated:** July 2, 2007

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.114**

or suggested in Boebert along with a lack of a trusted user interface engine in a computer having both a secured execution environment and second execution environment.

The remarks and arguments provided above with respect to claims 1, 15, and 29 also apply to their respective dependant claims as well. In review of the above remarks, arguments and amendments, it is requested that the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 14, 28, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,822,435, in the name of Boebert *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as “Boebert”) and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,121,962 in the name of Hwang.

The remarks and arguments provided above with respect to claims 1, 15, and 29 apply here as well. Hwang disclosure relates to screen display states in relation to the power up or power management status or change of the computer. Hwang gives no indication of change in a secure execution environment’s input mode based on the power management change of state. The input mode of the secure execution environment is not equivalent to what the system may be displaying on a potential output mode of the environment. Further, Hwang only requires a password which if accepted turns on and change the state of the screen display, no change in a secure input mode of the is shown. Applicants respectfully submit that Hwang simply does not contemplate changing a secured execution environment from a standard mode to a nexus input mode as claimed.

In review of the above remarks and arguments, it is requested that the rejection of claim 14, 28, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-2818/305956.01  
**Application No.:** 10/693,061  
**Office Action Dated:** July 2, 2007

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.114**

### **CONCLUSION**

It is requested that the forgoing amendments, arguments, and remarks be entered, and in view thereof, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow this application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss resolution of any remaining issues.

Date: October 2, 2007

**/Joseph F. Oriti/**  
Joseph F. Oriti  
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439\*